

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Owen Godshall	Team: Squad #9	CCRB Case #: 201801302	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Tuesday, 01/23/2018 7:30 PM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 104	18 Mo. SOL 7/23/2019	EO SOL 7/23/2019	
Date/Time CV Reported Wed, 02/14/2018 9:38 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Call Processing System	Date/Time Received at CCRB Wed, 02/14/2018 9:38 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Witness(es)	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. SGT Anibelka Perpinal	02950	942871	104 PCT
2. POM Gregory Montalbano	16254	957866	104 PCT
3. POM Roben Kikirov	01503	938767	104 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Harjinder Singh	13273	952244	104 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Roben Kikirov	Abuse: Police Officer Roben Kikirov threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
B.POM Roben Kikirov	Discourtesy: Police Officer Roben Kikirov spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
C.SGT Anibelka Perpinal	Abuse: In front of § 87(2)(b) in Queens, Sergeant Anibelka Perpinal threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
D.SGT Anibelka Perpinal	Abuse: Sergeant Anibelka Perpinal entered § 87(2)(b) in Queens.	§ 87(2)(b)
E.SGT Anibelka Perpinal	Abuse: Sergeant Anibelka Perpinal searched § 87(2)(b) in Queens.	§ 87(2)(b)
F.SGT Anibelka Perpinal	Abuse: Inside of § 87(2)(b) in Queens, Sergeant Anibelka Perpinal threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
G.POM Roben Kikirov	Abuse: Police Officer Roben Kikirov searched § 87(2)(b)'s phone.	§ 87(2)(b)
H.SGT Anibelka Perpinal	Discourtesy: Sergeant Anibelka Perpinal spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Case Summary

On February 14, 2018, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the CCRB via the Call Processing System.

Prior to this incident, § 87(2)(b) moved into his boyfriend § 87(2)(b) apartment, located in the basement of § 87(2)(b) in Queens. § 87(2)(b) subsequently obtained an order of protection against § 87(2)(b). The order prevented § 87(2)(b) from entering his apartment. This upset § 87(2)(b) landlords, § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b). They wanted § 87(2)(b) to leave the apartment so that § 87(2)(b) could return.

At approximately 7:30 p.m. on January 23, 2018, § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) found that § 87(2)(b) had applied locks to the basement door, preventing them from reaching the building's common areas located inside of the basement. § 87(2)(b) called 911 in order to gain access to the areas. PO Harjinder Singh and PO Roben Kikirov of the 104th Precinct responded to the call and spoke to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) outside of the building. While there, § 87(2)(b) arrived at the location. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) claimed that § 87(2)(b) had moved into the apartment less than thirty days earlier. The officers asked § 87(2)(b) if he had any proof that he had lived there longer than thirty days, but § 87(2)(b) was unable to produce it. PO Kikirov allegedly threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) for trespassing if he could not produce any proof (**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority – Threat of arrest**, § 87(2)(g)). PO Kikirov also allegedly referred to § 87(2)(b) as a “smart ass” (**Allegation B: Discourtesy – Word**, § 87(2)(g)).

§ 87(2)(b) asked the officers to summon a supervisor. The 104th Precinct patrol supervisor, Sgt. Anibelka Perpinal, and her operator, PO Gregory Montalbano, responded to the building. After § 87(2)(b) explained the situation to Sgt. Perpinal, she also allegedly threatened to arrest him for trespassing (**Allegation C: Abuse of Authority – Threat of arrest**, § 87(2)(g)). Sgt. Perpinal then told § 87(2)(b) that they were going to enter the basement. § 87(2)(b) allegedly told the officers that he did not consent for them to enter the apartment. Despite this, Sgt. Perpinal led the other officers into the basement (**Allegation D: Abuse of Authority – Premises entered**, § 87(2)(g)). Once they were inside, the officers searched through paperwork belonging to § 87(2)(b) without first obtaining his permission (**Allegation E: Abuse of Authority – Premises searched**, § 87(2)(g)). Sgt. Perpinal then allegedly told § 87(2)(b) that he would be arrested for violating his order of protection (**Allegation F: Abuse of Authority – Threat of arrest**, § 87(2)(g)). § 87(2)(b) objected, stating that § 87(2)(b) had violated the order by texting him. He showed § 87(2)(b) text messages to PO Kikirov to prove it. PO Kikirov allegedly took § 87(2)(b)'s phone and started to examine other information in the phone besides the text messages (**Allegation G: Abuse of Authority – Search**, § 87(2)(g)). Sgt. Perpinal allegedly told § 87(2)(b) “Pack your shit and go” (**Allegation H: Discourtesy – Word**, § 87(2)(g)). PO Singh prepared a Domestic Incident Report to document the contact between § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b). The officers then left without arresting § 87(2)(b).

§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

No video footage was found for this incident.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Roben Kikirov threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (C) Abuse of Authority: In front of § 87(2)(b) in Queens, Sergeant Anibelka Perpinal threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(g)

It is undisputed that § 87(2)(b) moved into the basement of § 87(2)(b) prior to this incident. § 87(2)(b)'s boyfriend, § 87(2)(b) had leased living space in the basement from § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) who own the building. § 87(2)(b) subsequently obtained an order of protection against § 87(2)(b) that prevented § 87(2)(b) from entering the building. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) wanted § 87(2)(b) to leave the apartment so that § 87(2)(b) could return. When PO Kikirov and PO Singh responded to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) told them that § 87(2)(b) was not a resident of the building and did not belong there. They repeated this claim when Sgt. Perpinal arrived. § 87(2)(b) told the officers that he had been living in the apartment for more than thirty days, but was unable to provide any documentary proof of his residence there.

§ 87(2)(b) was interviewed at the CCRB on February 26, 2018 (See Board Review #01: § 87(2)(b)'s Statement). He stated that he moved into § 87(2)(b) apartment in November of 2017, and had therefore been living there for more than thirty days at the time of the incident. When he arrived at § 87(2)(b) he found that PO Kikirov and PO Singh were speaking to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b). PO Kikirov told § 87(2)(b) that § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) Dobkowski had accused § 87(2)(b) of trespassing illegally in the basement. When § 87(2)(b) was unable to produce proof of the length of his residence in the basement, PO Kikirov told § 87(2)(b) that if he could not prove that he had lived in the building for more than thirty days, then he would be arrested if he tried to enter the building. Later, Sgt. Perpinal came to § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) explained the situation to her. Sgt. Perpinal told § 87(2)(b) that because his name was not on the basement's lease, and because § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) did not want him to live there, he would be arrested for trespassing. Neither Sgt. Perpinal, PO Kikirov nor any of the other officers attempted to place § 87(2)(b) under arrest at any point during the incident.

§ 87(2)(b) provided a telephone statement on March 5, 2018. § 87(2)(b) provided a telephone statement on March 23, 2018 (See Board Review #02-03: Witness Statements). They identified themselves as the owners of § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) landlords. § 87(2)(b) called 911 to report § 87(2)(b) for improperly barring them from the basement. When PO Kikirov and PO Singh arrived, both § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) told the officers

that § 87(2)(b) was residing illegally in the building and that they were trying to have him evicted. § 87(2)(b) arrived at the building a few minutes after the officers. PO Kikirov and PO Singh asked § 87(2)(b) to produce evidence to show how long he had lived in the building. § 87(2)(b) was unable to produce any evidence. Neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) recalled hearing PO Kikirov, Sgt. Perpinal or any of the other officers tell § 87(2)(b) that he would be arrested for any reason.

PO Kikirov was interviewed at the CCRB on July 5, 2018 (See Board Review #04: PO Kikirov's Statement). He stated that when he and PO Singh first arrived at § 87(2)(b) the landlords told him that § 87(2)(b) had locked them out of the basement's common areas. PO Kikirov confirmed that he asked § 87(2)(b) to produce proof of his residence, and that § 87(2)(b) was unable to produce any proof. He denied that he told § 87(2)(b) that he would be arrested during the incident. Later, when Sgt. Perpinal arrived, she told § 87(2)(b) to allow the landlords access to the basement's common areas. She did not tell § 87(2)(b) that he might be arrested.

Sgt. Perpinal was interviewed at the CCRB on April 23, 2018 (See Board Review #05: Sgt. Perpinal's Statement). She stated that the landlords informed her when she arrived at § 87(2)(b) that § 87(2)(b) was illegally occupying the basement and was trespassing on their property. Sgt. Perpinal then turned to § 87(2)(b) and told him that he would be placed under arrest if he was trespassing at the location. § 87(2)(b) objected, stating that he was not trespassing and that he had been living in the basement for more than thirty days. Sgt. Perpinal denied that she or any other officer told § 87(2)(b) that he would be arrested for any other reason while she was present at § 87(2)(b).

PO Singh was interviewed at the CCRB on May 16, 2018. PO Montalbano was interviewed at the CCRB on Jun 7, 2018 (See Board Review #06-07: MOS Statements). Both officers stated that the landlords told them that § 87(2)(b) was illegally living in the basement. PO Singh stated that § 87(2)(b) was asked to provide proof of his residence. PO Montalbano did not recall any such request being made of § 87(2)(b). PO Singh denied that PO Kikirov, Sgt. Perpinal or any other officer told § 87(2)(b) that he might be arrested for any reason. PO Montalbano did not recall any officers threatening to arrest § 87(2)(b) at any point.

NYPD Patrol Guide procedure 214-12 states that an individual who has resided in a dwelling for thirty or more consecutive days cannot be removed from the location save through the execution of an eviction notice (See Board Review #08: Legal Reference).

§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (B) Discourtesy: Police Officer Roben Kikirov spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (H) Discourtesy: Sergeant Anibelka Perpinal spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) alleged that while he and the officers initially spoke outside of § 87(2)(b) PO Kikirov referred to him several times as a “smartass.” He also alleged that later, when he and the officers went into the building, Sgt. Perpinal told him, “Pack your shit and go.”

§ 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) both denied hearing any of the officers use profanity during the incident. All of the officers interviewed denied that they or any other officer used profanity at any time.

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Anibelka Perpinal entered § 87(2)(b)
in Queens.

§ 87(2)(g)

It is undisputed that after Sgt. Perpinal arrived at § 87(2)(b) she and the other officers under her supervision entered § 87(2)(b) and went into the basement where § 87(2)(b) had been staying. The basement does not contain a discrete apartment. Instead, sections of the

basement have been walled off to create individual rooms, including a bedroom. The basement can be accessed through an exterior door that leads to the street, or through a staircase leading down from the first floor. There is a locked door at the top of this staircase to limit access to the basement from the first floor. In addition to private areas such as the bedroom, the basement contains common areas used by the entire building. At the time, the living areas within the basement were furnished with § 87(2)(b) belongings.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that the residence in the basement is an “illegal basement apartment.” The building’s boiler is kept in the basement in a separate room. § 87(2)(b) made no mention of any washing machines or dryers in the basement. § 87(2)(b) alleged that both PO Kikirov and PO Singh asked § 87(2)(b) if they could enter the basement. § 87(2)(b) told them that he did not want them to go into the apartment. Neither officer attempted to enter the apartment at that time. Later, when Sgt. Perpinal arrived at the location, she informed § 87(2)(b) that she and the other officers were going to go into his apartment. § 87(2)(b) told Sgt. Perpinal that he did not want her to go inside of § 87(2)(b). Sgt. Perpinal replied that she did not care what § 87(2)(b) wanted. § 87(2)(b) then escorted the officers into the first floor of § 87(2)(b). She unlocked the door to the staircase leading into the basement. § 87(2)(b) and the officers walked down into the basement. § 87(2)(b) followed after them. Once they were inside, Sgt. Perpinal walked into the bedroom and told § 87(2)(b) to point out any items inside that belonged to him.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that after Sgt. Perpinal arrived, § 87(2)(b) invited her and the other officers to come into the basement. He did not recall § 87(2)(b) reacting to the invitation by either consenting to let the officers in or by objecting to their presence. § 87(2)(b) led the officers into the basement common area by bringing them through the first floor and down the staircase. § 87(2)(b) accompanied them inside. Once they were in the basement, § 87(2)(b) led Sgt. Perpinal into his bedroom.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that she and § 87(2)(b) invited the officers into the basement’s common area and led them inside through the first floor. She denied that § 87(2)(b) objected to the officers entering the basement. § 87(2)(b) explained that the basement’s walled-off bedroom had a separate set of locks on it, and that § 87(2)(b) was the only person who had keys to the bedroom. Once the officers entered the basement, § 87(2)(b) unlocked his bedroom door in order to let the officers inside.

Sgt. Perpinal stated that § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) invited her and the other officers inside to inspect the basement. § 87(2)(b) did not say anything in response to this proposal. He did not tell the officers that he did not want them to go into the basement. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) led the officers into the first floor and then into the basement down the stairs. Once they were in the basement, § 87(2)(b) invited Sgt. Perpinal to come into the bedroom and review the items inside. The bedroom door was unlocked at the time.

PO Kikirov, PO Singh and PO Montalbano also stated that the landlords invited the officers to examine the basement. They denied that § 87(2)(b) objected to the officers entering the basement. PO Kikirov recalled that there was at least one walled-off room adjoining the common area, but he did not recall what kind of room it was. He denied that he or any other officers

entered the walled-off room. PO Singh did not recall the layout of the basement in detail. He did not recall if there were any walled-off rooms in the basement. He did not recall officers going into any areas in the basement besides the common area. PO Montalbano recalled that there was a walled-off bedroom and bathroom in the basement adjoining the common areas. He did not recall officers entering any of the walled-off rooms during the incident.

A warrantless search may only be challenged by one having a reasonable expectation of privacy in the place where the search occurs. People v. Mills, 159 A.D.2d 520 (2nd Dept., 1990) (See Board Review #09: Legal Reference).

§ 87(2)(g) [REDACTED]

§ 87(2)(g) [REDACTED]

§ 87(2)(g) [REDACTED]

Allegation (E) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Anibelka Perpinal searched § 87(2)(b) in Queens.

§ 87(2)(g) [REDACTED]

§ 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] stated that he kept several pieces of paperwork, including an application for public benefits, on a table in the basement's living area. When Sgt. Perpinal led the officers into the basement, § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] objected and told the officers that he did not want them to go inside of § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]. Once the officers were inside, PO Kikirov and PO Singh immediately picked up the documents and started to examine them. The officers did not obtain § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]'s permission before doing so.

§ 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] stated that after the officers entered the basement, § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] looked around the area for paperwork. § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] assumed that § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] was trying to produce the paperwork to prove his residency. He was not aware of any officers examining or searching

through any paperwork. § 87(2)(b) denied seeing any of the officers conduct any searches of any items in the basement. She made no mention of either § 87(2)(b) or any of the officers handling any paperwork.

Sgt. Perpinal stated that when she and the other officers entered the basement, § 87(2)(b) produced several pieces of paperwork, including a copy of the order of protection that he had taken out against § 87(2)(b) and the accompanying domestic incident report. § 87(2)(b) showed these documents directly to Sgt. Perpinal. Sgt. Perpinal initially stated that she did not review any other documents in the basement. She later recalled that she observed several documents lying on a table in the basement's living area. Sgt. Perpinal stated that she, rather than PO Kikirov or PO Singh, reviewed the documents. She did so to determine if the documents indicated how long § 87(2)(b) had been living in the apartment. She did not recall what the documents were. Sgt. Perpinal did recall she was unable to determine how long § 87(2)(b) had been living at § 87(2)(b) based on the information in the documents. Sgt. Perpinal denied obtaining consent to review the documents from § 87(2)(b) before she examined them.

PO Kikirov also stated that § 87(2)(b) produced several documents and showed them to the officers once they entered the basement. He did not recall what they were. PO Kikirov did not recall himself or any other officers examining any other documents that were found in the basement.

Neither PO Singh nor PO Montalbano recalled seeing any paperwork anywhere in the basement. They did not recall § 87(2)(b) producing any paperwork to show them, or finding any paperwork sitting on a table. They were not aware of any officers, including themselves, examining any documents in the basement.

A warrantless search may only be challenged by one having a reasonable expectation of privacy in the place or object of the search. People v. Mills, 159 A.D.2d 520 (2nd Dept., 1990) (See Board Review #09: Legal Reference).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (F) Abuse of Authority: Inside of § 87(2)(b) in Queens, Sergeant Anibelka Perpinal threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) alleged that after the officers entered the basement, he asked Sgt. Perpinal if he could leave the premises in order to file a complaint against § 87(2)(b) for contacting him via text message. Sgt. Perpinal told § 87(2)(b) that he would be arrested if he left. § 87(2)(b) asked what he would be arrested for. Sgt. Perpinal replied that he would be arrested for violating an order of protection. § 87(2)(b) was initially confused, as he was not the subject of any active orders of protection. § 87(2)(b) then told Sgt. Perpinal that § 87(2)(b) had emailed her a screenshot of a text message exchange between himself and § 87(2)(b). This exchange occurred after § 87(2)(b) had taken out the order of protection against § 87(2)(b). After viewing the screenshot, Sgt. Perpinal told § 87(2)(b) that he had violated the order of protection by exchanging text messages with § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) objected, stating that it was impossible for him to violate the order of protection because the order only targeted § 87(2)(b). Sgt. Perpinal insisted that § 87(2)(b)'s text message exchange with § 87(2)(b) violated the order of protection, and that § 87(2)(b) could be placed under arrest as a result of this. Neither Sgt. Perpinal nor any of the other officers made any effort to place § 87(2)(b) under arrest at any point.

§ 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) both stated that they did not recall any of the officers telling § 87(2)(b) that he would be arrested for any reason during the incident. They did not mention any discussion about text message exchanges between § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b). Neither of them claimed to have shown the officers any text messages that were exchanged between § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b).

Sgt. Perpinal stated that § 87(2)(b) did show her a screenshot of text messages that § 87(2)(b) had sent him. These text messages showed that § 87(2)(b) had contacted § 87(2)(b) despite the presence of the order of protection. Despite this, Sgt. Perpinal denied that she told § 87(2)(b) that he would be arrested for violating the order of protection that he took out against § 87(2)(b). While she acknowledged having told § 87(2)(b) that he could be arrested for trespassing earlier in the incident, she denied that she told § 87(2)(b) that he might be arrested for any other reason.

PO Kikirov and PO Singh denied that Sgt. Perpinal or any other officer told § 87(2)(b) that he would be arrested for violating the order of protection that he took against § 87(2)(b). Neither PO Kikirov nor PO Singh recalled § 87(2)(b) or § 87(2)(b) showing the officers any text messages that had been sent between § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b).

PO Montalbano did not recall § 87(2)(b) having an order of protection at the time of the incident. He did not recall himself or any other officers discussing any orders of protection with § 87(2)(b). He did not recall any officer telling § 87(2)(b) that he might be arrested for any reason, including violating an order of protection, at any point during the incident.

§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (G) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Roben Kikirov searched § 87(2)(b)'s phone.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that after Sgt. Perpinal told him that he could be arrested for violating the order of protection that he took out against § 87(2)(b), he took out his own cell phone. He pulled up a text message exchange between himself and § 87(2)(b). He pulled up a particular set of messages and handed the phone to PO Kikirov. § 87(2)(b) asked PO Kikirov to review the specific text messages that he had pulled up on the phone. Once PO Kikirov had the phone in his hand, however, he scrolled up on the screen to look at earlier text messages that § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) had sent to each other. § 87(2)(b) snatched his phone out of PO Kikirov's hand. § 87(2)(b) told PO Kikirov that he had only granted permission for him to view the text messages he had pulled up on the phone, and that PO Kikirov did not have permission to view any other information on the phone.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that § 87(2)(b) did take out his cell phone and hold it up to show it to the officers. He did not state what § 87(2)(b) was showing to the officers. He did not mention any discussion of a text exchange between § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) held onto his phone while he showed its contents to the officers. § 87(2)(b) denied seeing any of the officers hold or handle § 87(2)(b)'s phone at any point.

§ 87(2)(b) did not make any mention of § 87(2)(b) showing anything to the officers on his phone, or of an officer handling § 87(2)(b)'s phone. She did not mention any discussion of text messages sent between § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b).

PO Kikirov stated that while they were in the basement together, § 87(2)(b) showed him several text messages that he had exchanged with § 87(2)(b) on his cell phone. § 87(2)(b) pulled up the relevant text messages on his phone and then handed the phone to PO Kikirov. PO Kikirov denied that he reviewed or accessed any other information on § 87(2)(b)'s phone besides these text messages. He denied that § 87(2)(b) objected to him reviewing anything on the phone, or that § 87(2)(b) grabbed the phone out of his hand at any point.

Sgt. Perpinal did recall that § 87(2)(b) showed something to her on his cell phone. She did not recall what § 87(2)(b) showed her. She did not recall viewing any of § 87(2)(b)'s text messages. She did not recall any officers, including PO Kikirov, handling § 87(2)(b)'s phone. She did not recall § 87(2)(b) taking his phone away from any officers.

PO Singh and PO Montalbano did not recall § 87(2)(b) displaying anything to PO Kikirov or any other officer on a phone. They did not recall § 87(2)(b) displaying any text messages. They did not recall PO Kikirov or any other officers handling § 87(2)(b)'s cell phone. They did not recall § 87(2)(b) taking his cell phone away from any officers.

§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is the first CCRB complaint to which § 87(2)(b) has been a party (See Board Review #13: Civilian CCRB History).
- PO Kikirov has been a member of service for thirteen years and has been a subject in one previous CCRB complaint and two allegations. That complaint is still under investigation. § 87(2)(g)
- Sgt. Perpinal has been a member of service for eleven years and has been a subject in one previous CCRB complaint and one allegation. That complaint is still under investigation. § 87(2)(g)
- PO Montalbano has been a member of service for three years and has been a subject in two previous CCRB complaints and four allegations. None of these allegations were substantiated. § 87(2)(g)

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- § 87(2)(b) declined to mediate this complaint.
- A Notice of Claim request was submitted to the NYC Office of the Comptroller on July 27, 2018. It will be included in the case file upon receipt.
- [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]

Squad No.: _____

Investigator: _____

	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
Squad Leader:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date